

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

0.1 Member State	GR
0.2.1 Species code	5352
0.2.2 Species name	<i>Salmo louroensis</i>
0.2.3 Alternative species scientific name	N/A
0.2.4 Common name	Pestrophia Lourou

1. National Level

1.1 Maps

1.1.1 Distribution Map	Yes
1.1.1a Sensitive species	Yes
1.1.2 Method used - map	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
1.1.3 Year or period	2007-2012
1.1.4 Additional map	Yes
1.1.5 Range map	Yes

2. Biogeographical Or Marine Level

2.1 Biogeographical Region

2.2 Published sources

Mediterranean (MED)

Λεονάρδος Ι.Δ., Λιάσκο Ρ., Αναστασιάδου Χ., Γκένας Χ., Λιούσια Β. & Ντάκης Α., 2010. Δημιουργία συστήματος παρακολούθησης και εκτίμηση της περιβαλλοντικής κατάστασης των ποτάμιων συστημάτων Λούρου και Άραχθου και της ευρύτερης περιοχής του Αμβρακικού, Δημιουργία εδαφολογικών χαρτών και έλεγχος της ποιότητας των εδαφών των πεδινών εκτάσεων του βόρειου Αμβρακικού και Διερεύνηση αβιοτικών και βιοτικών παραμέτρων στον πυθμένα του Αμβρακικού Κόλπου και συσχέτισή τους με την ιχθυοπαραγωγή. Νομαρχιακή Αυτοδιοίκηση Άρτας, Τελική Περιβαλλοντική Έκθεση.

Delling B., 2003. Species diversity and phylogeny of *Salmo* with emphasis on southern trouts (Teleostei, Salmonidae). Stockholm University: PhD Thesis, Jannes Snabbtryck AB, Sweden.

Delling B., 2010. Diversity of western and southern Balkan trouts, with the description of a new species from the Louros River, Greece (Teleostei: Salmonidae). *Ichthyological Exploration of Freshwaters*, 21: 4, 331 – 344.

Kottelat M. & Freyhof J., 2007. Handbook of European freshwater fishes. Berlin: Kottelat, Cornol & Freyhof: 646pp.

Liasko R., Anastasiadou Ch., Ntakakis A., Gkenas Ch. and Leonardos I.D., 2012. Morphological differentiation among native trout populations in North-Western Greece. *Journal of Biological Research* 17: 33–43.

Ntakakis A., Liasko R., Oikonomou A. and Leonardos I., 2014. Growth pattern of an endemic and endangered West Balkan Peninsula trout species (*Salmo lourosensis*, Delling, 2010). *Journal of Applied Ichthyology*. doi: 10.1111/jai.12493.

NTAKIS A., OIKONOMOU A., LIASKO R. & LEONARDOS I., 2012. The use of non-lethal methods for the study of freshwater fishes. The case study of the endemic and endangered trout of Louros River. 34th Congress EEVE, Trikala.

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

OIKONOMOU A., NTAKIS A., ANASTASIADOU C. & LEONARDOS I., 2011. Salmo lourosensis, Delling, 2010: An endangered species and its conservation status. 33rd Congress EEVE, Edessa.

2.3 Range

2.3.1 Surface area - Range (km ²)	42
2.3.2 Method - Range surface area	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
2.3.3 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.3.4 Short-term trend direction	stable (0)
2.3.5 Short-term trend magnitude	min max
2.3.6 Long-term trend period	
2.3.7 Long-term trend direction	N/A
2.3.8 Long-term trend magnitude	min max
2.3.9 Favourable reference range	area (km ²) operator approximately equal to (≈) unknown No method Basic assumption: Favourable Reference Range = Surface Area Range (current range)
2.3.10 Reason for change	

2.4 Population

2.4.1 Population size (individuals or agreed exception)	Unit number of individuals (i) min 1752 max 1752
2.4.2 Population size (other than individuals)	Unit N/A min max
2.4.3 Additional information	Definition of locality Conversion method Problems
2.4.4 Year or period	2010-2011
2.4.5 Method – population size	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
2.4.6 Short-term trend period	2001-2012
2.4.7 Short term trend direction	decrease (-)
2.4.8 Short-term trend magnitude	min max confidence interval
2.4.9 Short-term trend method	Complete survey/Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate (3)
2.4.10 Long-term trend period	
2.4.11 Long term trend direction	N/A
2.4.12 Long-term trend magnitude	min max confidence interval
2.4.13 Long-term trend method	N/A
2.4.14 Favourable reference population	number operator much more than (>>) unknown No method Expert judgment.
2.4.15 Reason for change	

2.5 Habitat for the Species

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

2.5.1 Surface area - Habitat (km ²)	42
2.5.2 Year or period	2006-2012
2.5.3 Method used - habitat	Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)
2.5.4 a) Quality of habitat	Moderate
2.5.4 b) Quality of habitat - method	Based on partial data with some extrapolation and expert judgment.
2.5.5 Short term trend period	2001-2012
2.5.6 Short term trend direction	stable (0)
2.5.7 Long-term trend period	
2.5.8 Long term trend direction	N/A
2.5.9 Area of suitable habitat (km ²)	0
2.5.10 Reason for change	

2.6 Main Pressures

Pressure	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Discharges (E03)	medium importance (M)	N/A
Fishing and harvesting aquatic resources (F02)	high importance (H)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
modifying structures of inland water courses (J02.05.02)	high importance (H)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	medium importance (M)	N/A

2.6.1 Method used – pressures based exclusively or to a larger extent on real data from sites/occurrences or other

2.7 Main Threats

Threat	ranking	pollution qualifier(s)
Fishing and harvesting aquatic resources (F02)	high importance (H)	N/A
invasive non-native species (I01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction in migration/ migration barriers (J03.02.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
reduction or loss of specific habitat features (J03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A
large scale water deviation (J02.03.01)	high importance (H)	N/A

2.7.1 Method used – threats expert opinion (1)

2.8 Complementary Information

2.8.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends

2.8.2 Other relevant Information

The % threshold could not be used for the assessment since: a) a different method for assessing range was employed, compared to the 2nd Reporting 1.A recently described and poorly studied species, restricted to the upper Louros River. Its status should be considered “critically endangered” due to its numerical rarity and extremely restricted distribution. Disease, pollution, genetic introgression with translocated native trout and competition with escaped *Oncorhynchus mykiss* may represent serious threats to this species.

2. Basic Assumptions:

i) "Surface Area Range" (field 2.3.1) = value extracted from "Range Map" (field 1.1.5).

ii) "Favourable Reference Range" (field 2.3.9a) = a) "Surface Area Range" (field 2.3.1) OR b) value extracted from "Additional Reference Range Map" (provided). Depends on whether the Favourable range is equal or larger than actual species range.

Report on the main results of the surveillance under article 11 for annex II, IV and V species (Annex B)

iii) "Population Size" (field 2.4.2) = value extracted from "Distribution Map" (field 1.1.1) or "Additional Distribution Map" (field 1.1.4) (when provided).

iv) "Favourable Reference Population" (field 2.4.14) = a) "Population Size" (field 2.4.2) OR b) value extracted from "Additional Reference Range Map" (provided). Depends on whether the Favourable population is equal or larger than actual species population.

v) Habitat "Area Estimation" (field 2.5.1) = "Distribution Map" (field 1.1.1) or "Additional Distribution Map" (field 1.1.4) (when provided).

3. Population assessment and short term trend took into account, population structure and reproduction trends (Leonardos et al. 2010).

2.8.3 Trans-boundary assessment

2.9 Conclusions (assessment of conservation status at end of reporting period)

2.9.1 Range assessment Favourable (FV)
qualifiers N/A

2.9.2. Population assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers declining (-)

2.9.3. Habitat assessment Inadequate (U1)
qualifiers stable (=)

2.9.4. Future prospects assessment Bad (U2)
qualifiers declining (-)

2.9.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status Bad (U2)

2.9.5 Overall trend in Conservation Status declining (-)

3. Natura 2000 coverage and conservation measures - Annex II species

3.1 Population

3.1.1 Population Size Unit number of individuals (i)
min 0 max 0

3.1.2 Method used Estimate based on partial data with some extrapolation and/or modelling (2)

3.1.3 Trend of population size within N/A

3.2 Conversation Measures

3.2.1 Measure	3.2.2 Type	3.2.3 Ranking	3.2.4 Location	3.2.5 Broad Evaluation
Regulation/ Management of fishery in limnic systems (7.2)	Legal Administrative Recurrent	high importance (H)	Both	Enhance Long term